

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1 and 12 have been amended to recite active verbs of unwinding, printing, and cutting deeply, as well as recovering in claim 1.

Also, claims 1, 12 and 13 have been amended to replace “anvil cylinders” by “at least one anvil cylinder.” Support for the amendment is found in the original application, for example, at least page 6, line 9 and Fig. 2.

Further, claims 1 and 12 have been amended to recite that each of the cutting cylinders carries at least one respective cutting thread that cuts one of the cutting patterns respectively. Support for the amendment is found in the original application, for example, at least page 4, lines 7-15,

Still further, claims 1, 12 and 13 have been amended to recite that the cutting cylinders are in succession along a conveying path of the sheet. Support for the amendment is found in the original application, for example, at least page 6, lines 8-15, and Fig. 2.

The term “supplemented” in claim 13 has been clarified by reciting “complementary” and the term “entire figure” has been replaced by “at least two cutting patterns that intersect so as to constitute a resulting pattern that forms a detached element from the sheet.” Support for the added recitation is found in the original application, for example, page 4, lines 7-15.

Also the Markush group in claim 22 has been clarified.

The dependency of claims 16, 21, 25-27, 31 has been clarified.

The expressions introduced by “especially” or “in particular” have been deleted in claims 1, 6, 8, 10-14, 16, 19, and 23.

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, and 13 are the only independent claims.

Art rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-9, 11-18, and 20-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 5,697,649 to Dames et al. (“Dames”) in view of US 6,533,325 to Steidinger (“Steidinger’325”).

Further, claims 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Dames in view of Steidinger’325 and further in view of US 6,350,342 to Steidinger et al. (“Steidinger’342”).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action (see Office Action at page 3, first full paragraph), Steidinger’325 **does not disclose** a succession of cutting cylinders at col. 13, lines 9-26. Specifically, as discussed at the interview, this paragraph of Steidinger’325 only mentions a “die-cutting station” that includes “magnetic dies attached to “a magnetic die cylinder 133” (col. 13, line 14) and “a cooperating anvil cylinder 135” (col. 13, lines 16-17). Thus, die cutting cylinder 133 is facing anvil cylinder 135, but Steidinger’325 **does not disclose** a second cutting cylinder collaborating with the cutting cylinder 133 in order to form detached element. Namely, the anvil cylinder 135 does not carry a cutting thread, and it is not in succession with the cylinder 133 along a conveyance path of the substrate in the machine of Steidinger’325.

Even if, arguendo, the cutting element 143 arranged with source roll 127 and the other cutting elements arranged with source roll 130 (illustrated on Fig. 5 of Steidinger’325 and for

which no numeral reference is available) were considered to be cutting cylinders (which is denied, because they are not described as such, and thus, they are presumed to be static cutting elements along the roll to define web dimension), this would not result in the present invention, because Steidinger '325 is completely silent regarding synchronizing these cutting elements with cylinder 133, let alone having these cutting elements cooperate with cylinder 133 to form two cutting patterns that intersect so as to constitute a resulting pattern that will form a detached element.

Thus, Steidinger'325 does not provide any motivation or incentive to arrive at “a succession of at least two cutting patterns that intersect so as to constitute a resulting pattern that will form a detached element constituting the element of relatively small size,” let alone in a manner such that “this cutting operation taking place by means of a succession of synchronized cutting cylinders each carrying at least one respective cutting thread that cuts one of the cutting patterns respectively, said cutting cylinders being in succession along a conveying path of the sheet, at least one anvil cylinder being interposed between these cutting cylinders, the sheet passing between all these cylinders,” as recited in present claims 1 and 12.

Similarly, Steidinger'325 does not provide any motivation or incentive to arrive at “a succession of synchronized cutting cylinders having respective cutting threads, said cutting cylinders being in succession along a conveyance path of a sheet to be cut, anvil cylinders being interposed between these cutting cylinders, the cutting threads on the cylinders being complementary so as to form at least two cutting patterns that intersect so as to constitute a

resulting pattern that forms a detached element from the sheet when the cutting cylinders rotate in a synchronized manner and when suitably adjusted” as recited in present claim 13.

Further, it is submitted that Steidinger’325 uses a single cylinder for cutting its patterns because Steidinger’325 cuts out simple shapes (substantially rectangular cards) having relatively large dimensions. Thus, Steidinger’325 does not provide any guidance or suggestion regarding the cutting of elements of relatively small size such as planchettes, especially when precise shapes and dimensions are desired.

Further, the other cited references fail to remedy the deficiencies of Steidinger’325. In particular, Dames is silent regarding synchronized cutting cylinders. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In addition, with respect to the dependent claims, it is submitted that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the combined features of each of these respective claims. Therefore, each of the dependent claims is not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

If there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Application No. **10/589,001**
Art Unit: **3725**

Amendment under 37 CFR §1.111
Attorney Docket No.: **062842**

If this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/nicolas seckel/

Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

NES/rep